

**Amendment To The Drawings**

Please amend the drawings as follows:

Please enter the attached Replacement Sheet for sheet 2/4 showing an amended FIG. 2A.

## **REMARKS**

### **1. Status of Claims**

Claims 1-8 were pending in the Application. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 8 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants have added new dependent claims 9-20 that depend directly or indirectly from claim 1. Applicants respectfully request entry of the above amendments and consideration of the enclosed remarks. Applicants submit that no new matter is added. Accordingly, claims 1-20 will remain pending in the application.

### **2. Objections to the Drawings**

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings as allegedly not showing each feature of the claim. Applicants respectfully submit replacement Sheet 2/4 with amended FIG. 2A showing the bristles 117 and checkered grip handle 101 as supported in the specification at paragraphs 18 and 26. Furthermore, Applicants have amended the specification at paragraph 26 as supported by paragraph 18. The first and second strips are already supported in the figures such as by way of illustration strip 119 and strip 118.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the drawings comply and respectfully request entry of the amendments and withdrawal of the objection.

### **3. Rejections under 35 USC § 112**

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2-5 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended claim 1 for cosmetic reasons to correct a typographical error in changing lower surface to second surface. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims comply with 35 USC 112 and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

**4. Rejections under 35 USC § 102(b)**

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5 and 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,457,843 to Gelardi, et al. ("Gelardi '843").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 1 without prejudice or disclaimer and the rejection is moot.

Applicants respectfully submit that Gelardi '843 does not teach or suggest at least two strips of material attached to a substrate wherein:

the first strip is separated from the second strip by a first distance; and  
the first strip height is relatively large compared to the substrate thickness.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-3, 5 and 7-8 are patentable over the cited reference.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0226124A1 to Silva ("Silva '124").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 1 without prejudice or disclaimer and the rejection is moot.

Applicants respectfully submit that Silva '124 does not teach or suggest at least two strips of material attached to a substrate in a perpendicular to the feed path orientation and wherein:

the first strip is separated from the second strip by a first distance; and  
the first strip height is relatively large compared to the substrate thickness.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-3, 5 and 7 are patentable over the cited reference.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5 and 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,227,844 to Bhattacharjee, et al. ("Bhattacharjee '844").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 1 without prejudice or disclaimer and the rejection is moot.

Applicants respectfully submit that Bhattacharjee '844 does not teach or suggest at least two strips of material attached to a substrate wherein:

the first strip is separated from the second strip by a first distance; and  
the first strip height is relatively large compared to the substrate thickness.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-3, 5 and 7-8 are patentable over the cited reference. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-3, 5 and 7-8 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

#### **5. Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)**

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. 5,457,843 to Gelardi, et al. ("Gelardi '843") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,353,233 to Kikuchi, et al. ("Kikuchi '233").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 1 without prejudice or disclaimer and the rejection is moot.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submits that the cited references do not fairly teach or suggest:

at least two strips of material attached to a substrate in a perpendicular to the feed path orientation and wherein:

the first strip is separated from the second strip by a first distance; and  
the first strip height is relatively large compared to the substrate thickness.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 4 is patentable over the cited reference.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. 5,457,843 to Gelardi, et al. ("Gelardi '843"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 1 without prejudice or disclaimer and the rejection is moot.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6 is patentable over the cited reference.

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 6 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0226124A1 to Silva ("Silva '124") or U.S. Patent No. 5,227,844 to Bhattacharjee, et al. ("Bhattacharjee '844").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 1 without prejudice or disclaimer and the rejection is moot.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6 and 8 are patentable over the cited reference for at least the same reasons described above with reference to claim 1.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that the invention as presently claimed in claims 4, 6 and 8 is patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as described above with regard to claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 4, 6 and 8 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 9-20 are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons described above.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance.

**6. Conclusion Of Remarks**

For at least the reasons stated above, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of this application are in condition for allowance and early and favorable action thereon is requested.

If the Examiner believes that additional issues may be resolved by a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney for Applicant at (203) 924-3180.

**7. Authorization**

No fee is believed due with this response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for the response or credit any overpayment to the Pitney Bowes, Inc. Deposit Account Number 16-1885, Order No. F-670.

In the event that an extension of time or additional extension of time is required to make this response timely filed, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the Pitney Bowes, Inc. Deposit Account Number 16-1885, Order No. F-670.

Respectfully submitted,



George M. Macdonald  
Reg. No. 39,284  
Attorney for Applicant  
Telephone (203) 924-3180

PITNEY BOWES INC.  
Intellectual Property and Technology Law Department  
35 Waterview Drive, P.O. Box 3000  
Shelton, CT 06484-8000